

DECOMPOSING BOREL FUNCTIONS USING THE SHORE-SLAMAN JOIN THEOREM

TAKAYUKI KIHARA

ABSTRACT. Jayne and Rogers proved that every function from an analytic space into a separable metric space is decomposable into countably many continuous functions with closed domains if and only if the preimage of each F_σ set under it is again F_σ . Several researchers conjectured that the Jayne-Rogers theorem can be generalized to all finite levels of Borel functions. In this paper, by using the Shore-Slaman join theorem on the Turing degrees, we show the following variant of the Jayne-Rogers theorem at finite and transfinite levels of the hierarchy of Borel functions: For all countable ordinals α and β with $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha \cdot 2$, every function between Polish spaces with small inductive dimension $\neq \infty$ is decomposable into countably many $\Sigma_{\gamma(n)+1}^0$ -measurable functions with Π_β^0 domains and a sequence $\{\gamma(n)\}_{n \in \omega}$ such that $\gamma(n) + \alpha \leq \beta$ if and only if, from each $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^0$ set, one can continuously find its $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^0$ preimage.

1. SUMMARY

1.1. Introduction. In the early 20th century, Nikolai Luzin asked whether every Borel function on the real line can be decomposed into countably many continuous functions. The Luzin problem was negatively answered in the 1930s. Then, *which Borel functions are decomposable into continuous functions?* In the end of the 19th century, Baire introduced a well-known hierarchy of real functions by iterating pointwise limits of continuous functions. A famous theorem by Lebesgue, Hausdorff, and Banach states that every real function is of Baire class α if and only if the preimage of each open set under it is a Borel set of rank $\alpha + 1$, i.e., a $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^0$ set in the well-known Borel hierarchy. One can introduce finer hierarchy of Borel functions than Baire's one. For countable ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$, a function is called $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$ if the preimage of each Σ_α^0 set under it is Σ_β^0 . Then, where is the boundary of decomposability in the hierarchy of Borel functions?

A remarkable theorem proved by Jayne-Rogers [11] states that the $\Sigma_{2,2}$ functions are precisely the Δ_2^0 -piecewise continuous functions, where for a class Γ of Borel sets and a class $\mathcal{F}$ of Borel functions, we say that a function is Γ -piecewise $\mathcal{F}$ (denoted by the symbol $\text{dec}_\Gamma \mathcal{F}$ if Γ is a delta class Δ_α^0) if it is decomposable into countably many $\mathcal{F}$ -functions with Γ domains. Subsequently, Solecki [25] showed a dichotomy for Borel functions (see also [16, 19, 21]) to sharpen the Jayne-Rogers theorem by using the Gandy-Harrington topology from effective descriptive set theory.

More recently, a significant breakthrough was made by Semmes [23], who used several variations of Wadge games with *priority argument* to show that on zero-dimensional Polish space ω^ω , the $\Sigma_{3,3}$ functions are precisely the Δ_3^0 -piecewise

continuous functions, and the $\Sigma_{2,3}$ functions are precisely the Δ_3^0 -piecewise Σ_2^0 -measurable (i.e., $\Sigma_{1,2}$) functions. The countable decomposability at all finite levels of Borel hierarchy have been studied by Pawlikowski-Sabok [19] and Motto Ros [16]. Naturally, many researchers expected that the Jayne-Rogers theorem and the Semmes theorem could be generalized to all finite levels of the hierarchy of Borel functions (see [1, 16, 19, 23]).

Decomposability Conjecture (see [16, Conjecture 1.6]). *On separable metric spaces with analytic domain, $\Sigma_{m+1,n+1} = \text{dec}_{n+1} \Sigma_{1,n-m+1}$ holds. In other words, the $\Sigma_{m+1,n+1}$ functions are precisely the Δ_{n+1}^0 -piecewise Σ_{n-m+1}^0 -measurable functions at all finite levels $m, n \in \omega$.*

In this paper, we introduce the notion of the $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}^\rightarrow$ functions, which are more amenable than the $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$ functions. Roughly speaking, a function is said to be $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}^\rightarrow$ if a continuous function witnesses that it is $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$, that is, a continuous function maps each code of a Σ_α^0 set to a code of its Σ_β^0 preimage (For precise definition, see Definition 1.2). One can also realize this notion by introducing lightface (i.e., computable) versions of the $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$ functions and relativizing them by oracles.

Here, we should emphasize the significance of the concept of decomposability in computability theory and computer science. As typical examples from computational complexity theory, nonuniform complexity classes are usually defined as classes of problems that are feasibly solvable with advice strings, that is, classes of problems solved by piecewise feasible functions. For several applications of nonuniform computability on countably-based topological spaces, see [4, 27]. Moreover, it is important to note that a certain type of computational learning process (such as the identification in the limit) can be captured as the Δ_2^0 -piecewise continuity [3, 6, 9]. Further, as a type of piecewise continuity, the concept of layerwise computability based on Luzin's theorem in measure theory is playing a greater role in the algorithmic randomness theory and effective probability theory [10, 14].

Our main theorem states that for all countable ordinals α and β , every $\Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^\rightarrow$ function between quasi-Polish spaces with small inductive dimension $\neq \infty$ is decomposable into a countable list $\{F_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of functions such that each F_n is $\Sigma_{\gamma(n)+1}^0$ -measurable for some ordinal $\gamma(n)$ with $\gamma(n) + \alpha \leq \beta$. Furthermore, if $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha \cdot 2$, a function between Polish spaces with small inductive dimension $\neq \infty$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^\rightarrow$ if and only if it is decomposable into such a list $\{F_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ with $\text{dom}(F_n)$ is $\Delta_{\beta+1}^0$. This can be considered as a partial solution to the decomposability conjecture. To achieve our objective, we employ the Shore-Slaman join theorem on the Turing degrees to show the lightface (i.e., computable) version of our main theorem, and then, we obtain the boldface theorem by relativizing it.

1.2. Preliminaries. For the basic concepts of computable analysis, see Weihrauch [26], and for (effective) descriptive set theory, see Kechris [13] and Moschovakis [15].

The set of all natural numbers is denoted by ω , and for a set S , the set of all finite sequence of elements in S is denoted by $S^{<\omega}$. The notation $f : \subseteq X \rightarrow Y$ denotes that f is a partial function from X into Y . For any reals $X, Y \in \omega^\omega$, the symbol $X \leq_T Y$ denotes that X is Turing reducible to Y ; $X \oplus Y$ to denote the real Z with $Z(2n) = X(n)$ and $Z(2n+1) = Y(n)$. Given $X \in \omega^\omega$ and $e, n, m \in \omega$, the notation $\Phi_e(X; n) = m$ denotes that the e -th Turing machine with input n and oracle X halts and outputs the value m . As usual, we sometimes think of each Turing machine Φ_e as a partial function from ω^ω into ω^ω , where its domain

$\text{dom}(\Phi_e)$ is the set of all oracles X such that $\Phi_e(X; n)$ is defined for all $n \in \omega$. Let X' denote the Turing jump of X , that is, the halting problem relative to X , and let $X^{(\alpha)}$ denote the α -th iterated Turing jump of X for every computable ordinal α .

Let ω^ω denote a Baire space of infinite sequences of natural numbers, that is, the topological product of countably many discrete spaces ω . A *representation* of a set $\mathcal{X}$ is a partial surjection from ω^ω onto $\mathcal{X}$. A partial function f between represented spaces $(\mathcal{X}, \rho)$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \rho')$ is said to be continuous (respectively, X -computable) if there exists a continuous (respectively, X -computable) function $g : \subseteq \omega^\omega \rightarrow \omega^\omega$ such that $\rho' \circ g(x) = f \circ \rho(x)$ for all $x \in \text{dom}(f \circ \rho)$. An element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is said to be X -computable if $\rho^{-1}\{x\}$ contains an X -computable element.

Recently, the Borel hierarchy on arbitrary topological spaces was slightly modified by several researchers (see [7, 22]). For a topological space $\mathcal{X}$, an open subset of $\mathcal{X}$ is called Σ_1^0 , and the complement of a Σ_α^0 set is called Π_α^0 for every $\alpha < \omega_1$. A subset of $\mathcal{X}$ is Σ_α^0 (or a Borel set of rank α) if it is of the form $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n \setminus B_n$, where for each $n \in \omega$, A_n and B_n are $\Sigma_{\beta_n}^0$ for some $\beta_n < \alpha$. A subset of $\mathcal{X}$ is called Δ_α^0 (or a Borel set of ambiguous class α) if it is both Σ_α^0 and Π_α^0 . If $\mathcal{X}$ is metrizable, this definition is equivalent to the classical Borel hierarchy.

Recall that every countable ordinal can be represented by a countable well-founded subtree of $\omega^{<\omega}$. Given a well-founded tree $W \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$, let $|W| < \omega_1$ denote the ordinal rank of W . We can safely assume that for every node $\sigma \in W$, either it is a leaf (i.e., a terminal node) or $\sigma \frown n \in W$ for all $n \in \omega$, where $\sigma \frown n$ is concatenation of σ and the one-bit string $\langle n \rangle$. We use the symbol $\langle \rangle$ to denote the empty string.

To represent the family $\Sigma_{|W|}^0(\mathcal{X})$ of all $\Sigma_{|W|}^0$ subsets of a represented space $(\mathcal{X}, \rho)$, we will define a total representation $\rho_W : \mathcal{P}(\omega^{<\omega}) \rightarrow \Sigma_{|W|}^0(\mathcal{X})$, where an effective bijection between ω and $\omega^{<\omega}$ is fixed. Let $\{O_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ be an enumeration of an open basis $\{\rho(I_\sigma) : \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}\}$ of $\mathcal{X}$, where I_σ is the clopen set generated by a finite string σ , i.e., $I_\sigma = \{p \in \omega^\omega : p \succ \sigma\}$. For each set $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$, we can effectively produce the tree $T|_W = \{\sigma \in W : (\forall \tau \preceq \sigma) \tau \in T\}$.

Definition 1.1 (Borel code up to the rank of T). For each $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$, $\rho_W(T)$ is the unique $\Sigma_{|W|}^0(\mathcal{X})$ set represented by the Borel code $T|_W$ in W . In other words, for each string $\sigma \in W$, we define a $\Sigma_{|W|}^0(\mathcal{X})$ set $[\sigma]_{T|_W}$ by transfinite induction as follows.

- (1) If $\langle \rangle$ is a leaf of W , $[\langle \rangle]_{T|_W} = \emptyset$.
- (2) If $\sigma \in T|_W$ is a leaf of W , but not a root, then $[\sigma]_{T|_W} = O_n$, where n is the last letter of σ .
- (3) If every immediate successor of $\sigma \in T|_W$ is a leaf of W , then

$$[\sigma]_{T|_W} = \bigcup \{O_n : \sigma \frown n \in T|_W\}.$$

- (4) Otherwise, $[\sigma]_{T|_W}$ is defined as follows:

$$[\sigma]_{T|_W} = \bigcup \{[\sigma \frown 2n]_{T|_W} \setminus [\sigma \frown 2n + 1]_{T|_W} : \sigma \frown 2n, \sigma \frown 2n + 1 \in T\}.$$

Then, $\rho_W(T)$ is defined to be $[\langle \rangle]_{T|_W}$. A subset of $\mathcal{X}$ is $\Sigma_{|W|}^{0,X}$ if it is an $(X \oplus W)$ -computable point in the represented space $(\Sigma_{|W|}^{0,X}(\mathcal{X}), \rho_W)$ for some W . A subset of $\mathcal{X}$ is $\Pi_{|W|}^{0,X}$ if it is the complement of a $\Sigma_{|W|}^{0,X}$ set, and it is $\Delta_{|W|}^{0,X}$ if it is both $\Sigma_{|W|}^{0,X}$ and $\Pi_{|W|}^{0,X}$.

Given an oracle $X \in 2^\omega$, as usual, let $\mathcal{O}^X$ denote Kleene's system of ordinal notations relative to X . The least ordinal that is not computable in X is denoted by ω_1^X , and the ordinal less than ω_1^X represented by $a \in \mathcal{O}^X$ is denoted by $|a|_{\mathcal{O}^X}$. Note that there is a partial computable function $W : \subseteq 2^\omega \times \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega^{<\omega})$ such that for every $X \in 2^\omega$ and $a \in \mathcal{O}^X$, we can obtain a well-founded tree $W_a^X = W(X, a) \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ of rank $\alpha = |a|_{\mathcal{O}^X}$ such that every Σ_α^0 set has a Borel code of the form $T|_{W_a^X}$ for some $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$.

Definition 1.2. Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real, let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ be ordinals, and let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces. A function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow}$ (respectively, $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^X$) if it is $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}$, and the function $F^{-1} : (\Sigma_\alpha^0(\mathcal{Y}), \rho_V) \rightarrow (\Sigma_\beta^0(\mathcal{X}), \rho_W)$ sending each Σ_α^0 set $S \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ to its preimage $F^{-1}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is continuous (respectively, X -computable) for some (respectively, X -computable) well-founded trees $V, W \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ with $|V| = \alpha$ and $|W| = \beta$.

To emphasize its domain and range, we sometimes write $F \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ (respectively, $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$). A $\Sigma_{1, \alpha}$ function and a $\Sigma_{1, \alpha}^X$ -computable function are often called a Σ_α^0 -measurable function and a $\Sigma_\alpha^{0, X}$ -computable function.

A representation is $\rho : \subseteq \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is *admissible* if for every partial continuous $f : \subseteq \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, there exists a partial continuous $g : \subseteq \omega^\omega \rightarrow \omega^\omega$ such that $f = \rho \circ g$.

Remark 1.3. In [8], de Brecht-Yamamoto showed that for all countable ordinals α , a function between admissibly represented spaces is Σ_α^0 -measurable if and only if it is $\Sigma_{1, \alpha}^{\rightarrow}$. Therefore, we have $\Sigma_{1, \alpha} \subseteq \Sigma_{1+\beta, \alpha+\beta}^{\rightarrow}$. In general, $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+\gamma, \beta+\gamma}^{\rightarrow}$ holds for all ordinals $\alpha, \beta, \gamma < \omega_1$. The effective hierarchy of Borel functions at finite levels has also been studied by Brattka [2].

Remark 1.4. It is known that every countably-based T_0 space has an admissible representation. A separable completely metrizable space is called *Polish*, and a countably-based completely quasi-metrizable space is called *quasi-Polish*. In [7], de Brecht showed that a countably-based space is quasi-Polish if and only if it has a total admissible representation.

Hereafter, all represented space which we will mention are assumed to be admissibly represented.

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a class of partial functions from a represented space $\mathcal{X}$ into a represented space $\mathcal{Y}$.

- (1) A function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is *countably $\mathcal{F}$* (denoted by $\mathbf{dec}\mathcal{F}$) if there is a countable partition $\{Q_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ such that $F \upharpoonright Q_i \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $i \in \omega$. Moreover, if each piece Q_i can be chosen as a Δ_α^0 set, then F is said to be Δ_α^0 -*piecewise $\mathcal{F}$* (denoted by $\mathbf{dec}_\alpha \mathcal{F}$).
- (2) A function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is *countably $\Sigma_\beta^{0, X}$ -computable* (denoted by $\mathbf{dec}\Sigma_{1, \beta}^X$) if there is a countable partition $\{Q_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ such that $F \upharpoonright Q_i$ is $\Sigma_\beta^{0, X}$ -computable uniformly in $i \in \omega$. Moreover, if $\{Q_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ is uniformly $\Delta_\alpha^{0, Y}$, then F is said to be $\Delta_\alpha^{0, Y}$ -*piecewise $\Sigma_\beta^{0, X}$ -computable* (denoted by $\mathbf{dec}_\alpha^Y \Sigma_{1, \beta}^X$).

The $\Sigma_{2, 2}^{\rightarrow}$ functions have been studied by Pauly-de Brecht [18], who showed that two equalities $\Sigma_{2, 2} = \mathbf{dec}_2 \Sigma_{1, 1}$ and $\Sigma_{2, 2}^{\rightarrow} = \mathbf{dec}_2 \Sigma_{1, 1}^{\rightarrow}$ hold. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{dec}_\beta \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow} = \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow}$ holds.

- Example 1.6.** (1) $\Sigma_{1,\alpha+1}(2^\omega) \not\subseteq \mathbf{dec}\Sigma_{1,\alpha}(2^\omega)$ holds for each $\alpha < \omega_1^{CK}$. Indeed, the α -th Turing jump $J^{(\alpha)} : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^0$ -computable, but is not countably Σ_α^0 -measurable.
- (2) Let $\chi_{\mathbb{Q}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2$ be Dirichlet's nowhere continuous function. Then, $\chi_{\mathbb{Q}} \in \Sigma_{3,3} \cap \mathbf{dec}_3\Sigma_{1,1}$, but $\chi_{\mathbb{Q}} \notin \Sigma_{1,2}$.

Later, we will use a notion of topological dimension. The *small inductive dimension* of a topological space $\mathcal{X}$ is denoted by $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X})$, which is inductively defined as follows: The dimension of the empty set $\emptyset$ is -1 , i.e., $\text{ind}(\emptyset) = -1$. For any ordinal α and nonempty space $\mathcal{X}$, $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \alpha$ if for every point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and every open neighborhood $U \ni x$ there is an open set $V \subseteq U$ containing x such that the dimension of its boundary ∂V is less than α . The dimension $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is the least ordinal α with $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \alpha$ if such a ordinal exists. Otherwise, we say that $\mathcal{X}$ has dimension ∞ .

Remark 1.7. Motto Ros, Schlicht, and Selivanov [17, Theorem 4.21] showed that for every uncountable quasi-Polish space $\mathcal{X}$ of small inductive dimension $\neq \infty$, there is a bijection $h : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that h is Δ_2^0 -piecewise continuous and h^{-1} is Δ_3^0 -piecewise continuous.

We will call such a bijection h a *level 3/2 Borel isomorphism* (or simply, a 3/2-isomorphism). Moreover, for instance, if a space $\mathcal{X}$ is the Euclidean n -space $\mathbb{R}^n$ or the unit n -sphere S^n , it is computably 3/2-isomorphic to Baire space ω^ω , where a bijection $h : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is called an *X-computable 3/2-isomorphism* for some oracle $X \in 2^\omega$ if $h \in \mathbf{dec}_2^X\Sigma_{1,1}^X$ and $h^{-1} \in \mathbf{dec}_3^X\Sigma_{1,1}^X$. This is because the boundary sphere $\partial B(q; r)$ of each rational open ball is Π_1^0 uniformly in its center q with ratio r , and the Π_2^0 set $\mathcal{X} \setminus \bigcup_{q,r} \partial B(q; r)$ is computably homeomorphic to a Π_1^0 subspace of ω^ω (see also [17, Theorems 4.7 and 4.21]).

1.3. Main Theorem. By $\beta \hat{-} \alpha$, we denote the smallest ordinal δ with $\delta + \alpha > \beta$. To present our main theorem, we use the notation $\Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)} = \bigcup_{\gamma < \beta \hat{-} \alpha} \Sigma_{1,\gamma+1}$.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be quasi-Polish spaces with $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X}), \text{ind}(\mathcal{Y}) \neq \infty$, and let $\alpha \leq \beta < \omega_1$ be countable ordinals, where we assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is Polish if $\alpha = 1$. Then, we have the following inclusions.*

$$\mathbf{dec}_{\beta+1}\Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \mathbf{dec}\Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be quasi-Polish spaces with $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X}), \text{ind}(\mathcal{Y}) \neq \infty$. For any countable ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$ with $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha \cdot 2$, we have the following equality.*

$$\Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \mathbf{dec}_{\beta+1}\Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}),$$

where we assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is Polish if $\alpha = 1$.

Corollary 1.10. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be quasi-Polish spaces with $\text{ind}(\mathcal{X}), \text{ind}(\mathcal{Y}) \neq \infty$. For any natural numbers $m, n \in \omega$ with $m \leq n < 2m$, we have the following equality.*

$$\Sigma_{m+1,n+1}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \mathbf{dec}_{n+1}\Sigma_{1,n-m+1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}),$$

where we assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is Polish if $m = 1$.

2. MAIN TOOLS

2.1. Shore-Slaman Join Theorem. The key lemma used in our proof of Theorem 1.9 is a join theorem concerning the class of α -REA operators shown by Shore and Slaman. Here, a function $F : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$ is called an α -REA operator if it is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^0$ -computable, and there is a computable function π such that $\pi \circ F = \text{id}_{2^\omega}$. We will use the Shore-Slaman join theorem only for the α -REA operator $J^{(\alpha)} : x \mapsto x^{(\alpha)}$.

Theorem 2.1 (Shore-Slaman Join Theorem [24]). *Let α be a computable ordinal. The Turing degree structure $(\mathcal{D}_T, \leq, ', \oplus)$ satisfies the following formula, for each $k \in \omega$.*

$$(\forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})(\exists \mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{a}) [((\forall \beta < \alpha) \mathbf{b} \not\leq \mathbf{a}^{(\beta)}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{c}^{(\alpha)} \leq \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{a}^{(\alpha)} \leq \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{c})].$$

For $\alpha = 1$, it is exactly the Posner-Robinson join theorem [20]. Historically, Jockusch and Shore [12] were the first to ask whether the Posner-Robinson join theorem can be generalized to all n -REA operators for $n \in \omega$. The main tool for addressing their question was introduced by Kumabe and Slaman, who showed the join theorem for $\alpha = \omega$ (for Kumabe-Slaman forcing, see also Day-Dzhafarov [5]). Finally, Shore and Slaman proved the join theorem for all computable ordinals α . It is noteworthy that by combining it with the Slaman-Woodin double jump definability theorem, they showed that the Turing jump is first-order definable in the partial ordering $(\mathcal{D}_T, \leq)$ of the Turing degrees.

We employ the Shore-Slaman join theorem to show our main theorem. For Corollary 1.10 with $m = n$, we only require the Shore-Slaman join theorem for $\alpha = 1$, i.e., the Posner-Robinson join theorem. To show Theorem 1.9 on all levels of Borel hierarchy, we need the Shore-Slaman join theorem for all countable ordinals $\alpha < \omega_1$. By analyzing the proof of Shore-Slaman [24], it is not difficult to see that their theorem can be generalized to all countable ordinals $\alpha < \omega_1^X$, for any $X \in 2^\omega$. Here, ω_1^X is the least countable ordinal that is not computable in X .

Remark 2.2. Here, the notion $\mathbf{d}^{(\alpha)}$ could be ill-defined. Therefore, if X is fixed, by $\mathbf{d}^{(\alpha; X)}$ only for $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{x}$, we denote the α -th Turing jump relative to X , which is defined along with Kleene's system $\mathcal{O}^X$ of ordinal notations relative to X . Then, the notion $\mathbf{d}^{(\alpha)} = \mathbf{d}^{(\alpha; X)}$ for $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{x}$ and $\alpha < \omega_1^X$ turns out to be well-defined, as in Spector's uniqueness theorem.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $X \in \omega^\omega$ be a real of Turing degree $\mathbf{x}$, and let $\alpha < \omega_1^X$ be a countable ordinal. The Turing degree structure $(\mathcal{D}_T, \leq, ', \oplus)$ satisfies the following formula, for each $k \in \omega$.*

$$(\forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})(\exists \mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{x}) [((\forall \beta < \alpha) \mathbf{b} \not\leq (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{x})^{(\beta)}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{c}^{(\alpha)} \leq \mathbf{b} \oplus (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{x})^{(\alpha)} \leq \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{c})].$$

2.2. Boldface versus Lightface.

Lemma 2.4 (Relativization I). *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces, and let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$ be countable ordinals. A function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow}$ if and only if it is $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^X$ for some $X \in 2^\omega$ with $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$.*

Proof. Assume that topological spaces $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are represented by $\rho^{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\rho^{\mathcal{Y}}$ respectively, and that a function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^{\rightarrow}$. Then, there are well-founded trees $W(\alpha)$ and $W(\beta)$ with $|W(\alpha)| = \alpha$ and $|W(\beta)| = \beta$ such that

$F^{-1} : (\Sigma_\alpha^0(\mathcal{Y}), \rho_{W(\alpha)}^\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\Sigma_\alpha^0(\mathcal{X}), \rho_{W(\beta)}^\mathcal{X})$ is continuous. In particular, it is X -computable for some $X \in 2^\omega$ with $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$. $\square$

Lemma 2.5 (Relativization II). *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces, and let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$ be a countable ordinal. A function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathbf{dec}_\beta \Sigma_{1,\alpha}$ if and only if it is $\mathbf{dec}_\beta^X \Sigma_{1,\alpha}^X$ for some $R \in 2^\omega$ with $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$.*

Proof. Assume that we have a countable partition $\{X_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ such that $X_i \in \Delta_\beta^0$ and $F_i = F \upharpoonright X_i$ is Σ_α^0 -measurable for each $i \in \omega$. Recall that $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ always assumed to have admissible representations. Therefore, F_i is $\Sigma_{1,\alpha}^\rightarrow$ for every $i \in \omega$ as mentioned in Remark 1.3. Select an oracle $Q \in 2^\omega$ such that $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^Q$. Then, for each $i \in \omega$, X_i is Π_β^{0,x_i} for some real $x_i \in 2^\omega$, and F_i is $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,c_i \oplus Q}$ -computable for some real $c_i \in 2^\omega$. Consider functions $p, q : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that X_i is the $p(i)$ -th Δ_β^{0,x_i} set and F_i is the $q(i)$ -th partial $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,c_i \oplus Q}$ -computable function for each $i \in \omega$. Put $X = Q \oplus p \oplus q \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \omega} x_i \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \omega} c_i$. Then, $\{X_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ is uniformly $\Delta_\beta^{0,X}$ and $\{F_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ is uniformly $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ -computable. $\square$

The inclusion $\mathbf{dec}_{\beta+1} \Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)} \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^\rightarrow$ in Theorem 1.8 can be easily shown by relativizing the following lemma. Here, recall from Remark 1.4 that every quasi-Polish space has an admissible representation.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces. Fix an oracles X , and ordinals $\alpha \leq \beta < \omega_1^X$.*

$$\mathbf{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Proof. Assume that $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is $\Delta_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$ -piecewise $\Sigma_{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^{0,X}$ -computable. Fix an R -computable sequence $\{P_e\}_{e \in \omega}$ of $\Delta_{\beta+1}^{0,X}(\mathcal{X})$ sets such that $H_e = F \upharpoonright P_e$ is $\Sigma_{\gamma(e)+1}^{0,X}(\mathcal{X})$ -computable, where $\gamma(e) < \beta \hat{-} \alpha$. Then, for each $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}(\mathcal{Y})$ set $S \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, the preimage $F^{-1}(S)$ is the union of $\{H_e^{-1}(S) \cap P_e\}_{e \in \omega}$. Note that $H_e^{-1}(S)$ is $\Sigma_{\gamma(e)+\alpha+1}^{0,X}$, and the condition $\gamma(e) < \beta \hat{-} \alpha$ implies $\gamma(e) + \alpha \leq \beta$. Thus, $H_e^{-1}(S)$ is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$, and its index is computed from any index of S and e by the uniformity. Thus, $F^{-1}(S) = \bigcup_e (H_e^{-1}(S) \cap P_e)$ is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$, and we can effectively calculate its index. Hence, F is a $\Sigma_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}^X$ -function. $\square$

3. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

3.1. Uniformity of Borel Functions. Hereafter, we assume that every countable ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$ is represented by some well-founded tree $W(\alpha) \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ without mentioning, and for every represented space $(\mathcal{X}, \rho)$, the class of all Σ_α^0 subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ is implicitly assumed to be endowed with the topology given by the representation $\rho_{W(\alpha)}$. Each lightface subpointclass $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ is thought of as a subspace of the represented hyperspace $(\Sigma_\alpha^0(\mathcal{X}), \rho_{W(\alpha)})$.

Definition 3.1. Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real, let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ be ordinals, and let F be a function between represented spaces $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$. Let Γ and Λ be relativizable pointclasses.

- (1) The notation $F^{-1} : \Gamma \rightarrow \Lambda$ denotes that $S \in \Gamma(\mathcal{Y})$ implies $F^{-1}(S) \in \Lambda(\mathcal{X})$.
- (2) Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a represented space. We write $F^{-1}\Gamma^X \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^X$ if $F^{-1} \circ S : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \Lambda^X(\mathcal{X})$ is X -computable whenever $S : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \Gamma^X(\mathcal{Y})$ is X -computable.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real, and let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ be ordinals. If $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}^X$ function and $\mathcal{Z}$ is a represented space, $F^{-1}\Sigma_{\alpha}^{0, X \oplus Y} \subseteq^{\mathcal{Z}} \Sigma_{\beta}^{0, X \oplus Y}$ holds for all $Y \in 2^\omega$.*

Proof. Because $F^{-1} : \Sigma_{\alpha}^{0, X \oplus Y} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\beta}^{0, X \oplus Y}$ is computable. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Fix an oracle $X \in 2^\omega$, and fix $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$. For every function $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and every represented space $\mathcal{Z}$, if $F^{-1}\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0, X} \subseteq^{\mathcal{Z}} \Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$, $F^{-1}\Sigma_{\alpha}^{0, X} \subseteq^{\mathcal{Z}} \Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$ and $\mathbb{C}F^{-1}\Sigma_{\alpha}^{0, X} \subseteq^{\mathcal{Z}} \Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$ hold.*

Proof. Since $\Pi_{\alpha}^{0, X} \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0, X}$, for every $\Sigma_{\alpha}^{0, X}$ set $A \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, the preimages $F^{-1}(A)$ and $\mathbb{C}F^{-1}(A) = F^{-1}(\mathcal{Y} \setminus A)$ are $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$. $\square$

3.2. Turing Degree Analysis.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real, and let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ be ordinals. Assume that a function $F : D \rightarrow E$ satisfies $F^{-1}\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0, X} \subseteq^{\omega} \Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$, where D and E are subsets of ω^ω . If D is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$, $(F(x) \oplus X)^{(\alpha)} \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\beta)}$ holds for any $x \in D$.*

Proof. Note that $S_e^X = \{z \in E : (z \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}(e) = 1\}$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha}^0(E)$. Moreover, the function $S^X : \omega \rightarrow \Sigma_{\alpha}^0(E)$ sending e to S_e^X is X -computable. Hence, by Lemma 3.3, $F^{-1}S^X, \mathbb{C}F^{-1}S^X : \omega \rightarrow \Sigma_{\alpha+1}^0$ are X -computable. Let δ_x^D denote the Dirac measure centered on $x \in D$, that is, for each $A \subseteq D$, $\delta_x^D(A) = 1$ if $x \in A$ and $\delta_x^D(A) = 0$ otherwise. Let $\delta_x^{D, \beta+1} : \Sigma_{\beta+1}^0(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ denote its restriction to the class $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^0(D)$, where $\mathbb{S} = \{0, 1\}$ is Sierpiński's connected two-point space, whose open sets are $\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{0, 1\}\}$. Then, note that $\delta_x^{D, \beta+1}$ is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, x}$ -computable.

To determine whether $F(x) \in S_e^X$, that is, to determine the value of $\delta_{F(x)}^{E, \alpha} S^X(e)$, we first note that $\delta_{F(x)}^{E, \alpha} S^X = \delta_x^{D, \beta+1} F^{-1} S^X$ and $1 - \delta_{F(x)}^{E, \alpha} S^X = \delta_x^{D, \beta+1} \mathbb{C}F^{-1} S^X$ are $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, x}$ -computable as functions from $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^0(D)$ into $\mathbb{S}$. Hence, $\delta_{F(x)}^{E, \alpha} S^X$ is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, x \oplus X}$ -computable as a function from $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^0(D)$ into a discrete two-point space 2 . Since $\delta_{F(x)}^{E, \alpha} S^X$ is the characteristic function of $(F(x) \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}$, we obtain the inequality $(F(x) \oplus X)^{(\alpha)} \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\beta)}$ for any $x \in D$. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real, let $\alpha \leq \beta < \omega_1^X$ be ordinals, and let D be a $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X}$ subset of ω^ω . Assume that $F : D \rightarrow \omega^\omega$ is a $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$ function. Then, for every $x \in D$, there is an ordinal $\gamma < \beta \hat{-} \alpha$ such that $F(x) \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\gamma)}$ holds.*

Proof. Fix a $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$ function $F : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \omega^\omega$. Then, by Lemma 3.2, we have $F^{-1}\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0, X \oplus z} \subseteq^{\omega} \Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0, X \oplus z}$ for any $z \in \omega^\omega$. By Lemma 3.4, the function F must satisfy the inequality

$$(1) \quad (F(x) \oplus X \oplus z)^{(\alpha)} \leq_T (x \oplus X \oplus z)^{(\beta)}$$

for any $z \in \omega^\omega$ and $x \in D$. Suppose that there exists $x \in D$ such that $F(x) \not\leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\gamma)}$ holds for any $\gamma < \beta \hat{-} \alpha$. Put $y_X = F(x)$ and $x_X = x \oplus X$. By the inequality (1) with $z = \emptyset$ and from the definition of $\beta \hat{-} \alpha$, we have $y_X^{(\alpha)} \leq_T x_X^{(\beta)} <_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \alpha)}$. Therefore, there is an ordinal $\gamma < \alpha$ such that $y_X^{(\gamma)} \leq_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma)}$. Fix the least such ordinal $\gamma < \alpha$. We now have the following condition:

$$y_X^{(\theta)} \not\leq_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \theta)} \text{ for all } \theta < \gamma, \text{ and } y_X^{(\gamma)} \leq_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma)}.$$

Let $\mathbf{a}$ be the Turing degree of x_X , and let $\mathbf{b}$ be the Turing degree of $y_X^{(\gamma)}$. By the Shore-Slaman join theorem (Lemma 2.3) with such $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ and $\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma$, and by selecting $z \in \mathbf{c}$, we have $z \geq_T x_X$ such that $z^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma)} \equiv_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma)} \equiv_T y_X^{(\gamma)} \oplus z$, since γ is the least ordinal such that $y_X^{(\gamma)} \leq_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma)}$. As $\gamma < \alpha$, there is an ordinal $\theta \leq \alpha$ such that $\gamma + \theta = \alpha$. Then, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} x_X^{(\beta)} <_T x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \alpha)} &\equiv_T (x_X^{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma)})^{(\theta)} \equiv_T (y_X^{(\gamma)} \oplus z)^{(\theta)} \\ &\leq_T (y_X \oplus z)^{(\gamma + \theta)} \equiv_T (y_X \oplus z)^{(\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the inequality (1) and by the property of x ,

$$(y_X \oplus z)^{(\alpha)} \leq_T (x_X \oplus z)^{(\beta)} \equiv_T z^{(\beta)} \equiv_T x_X^{(\beta)},$$

since $\beta \hat{-} \alpha + \gamma \leq \beta$. By combining the two inequalities above, we have $x_X^{(\beta)} <_T x_X^{(\beta)}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, for any $x \in D$, there must exist an ordinal $\gamma < \beta \hat{-} \alpha$ such that $f(x) \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\gamma)}$ holds. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ be countable ordinals, and let D be a subset of ω^ω . Then, a function $F : D \rightarrow \omega^\omega$ is of class $\text{dec}\Sigma_{1, \alpha+1}^X$ if and only if the following condition holds:*

$$F(x) \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}, \text{ for any } x \in D.$$

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Fix a countable cover $\{X_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of D such that $F \upharpoonright X_i$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}$ -computable for each $i \in \omega$. By the universality of the Turing jump, there is a sequence of indices $\{e(i)\}_{i \in \omega}$ such that for each $i \in \omega$,

$$F(x) = \Phi_{e(i)}((x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}; x), \text{ for any } x \in D.$$

($\Leftarrow$) Conversely, define $Q_e = \{x \in D : \Phi_e((x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}) = F(x)\}$. For any $x \in D$, if a function satisfies $F(x) \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}$, there is an algorithm $e \in \omega$ such that $F(x) = \Phi_e((x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)})$. Therefore, $\bigcup_e Q_e = D$. Finally, $F_e = \Phi_e((x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)})$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}$ -computable for each $e \in \omega$, and $F \upharpoonright Q_e = F_e \upharpoonright Q_e$, for each $e \in \omega$, as desired. $\square$

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ be countable ordinals, and let D be a $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$ subset of ω^ω . Then, we have the following inclusion.*

$$\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X(D, \omega^\omega) \subseteq \text{dec}\Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X(D, \omega^\omega).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, we have $F(x) \leq_T (x \oplus X)^{(\alpha)}$ for any $x \in D$. Thus, by Lemma 3.6, F is countably $\Sigma_{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^{0,X}$. $\square$

Corollary 3.8. *Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real. Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces that are X -computably 3/2-isomorphic to ω^ω . For any ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ with $\beta \geq 2$, we have the following inclusion.*

$$\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \text{dec}^X \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Proof. If $\alpha = 0$, it is obvious. We assume that $\alpha \geq 1$. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{X}} : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be X -computable 3/2-isomorphisms. By Lemma 2.6, we have $h_{\mathcal{X}}, h_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \text{dec}_{\alpha+1}^X \Sigma_{1,1}^X \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+1, \alpha+1}^X$ and $h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1}, h_{\mathcal{Y}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1,1}^X \subseteq \Sigma_{\beta+1, \beta+1}^X$. Assume that $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$ function. It is not hard to see that the function $h_{\mathcal{Y}} F h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \omega^\omega$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$, since $h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \Sigma_{\beta+1, \beta+1}^X$ and $h_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \Sigma_{\alpha+1, \alpha+1}^X$. By Corollary

3.7, we can see that $h_{\mathcal{Y}} F h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1}$ is contained in the class $\text{dec}^X \Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{=}\alpha)}^X$. Consequently, $F = h_{\mathcal{Y}} h_{\mathcal{Y}}^{-1} F h_{\mathcal{X}} h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}^X \Sigma_{1,(\beta \hat{=}\alpha)}^X$ holds since $h_{\mathcal{Y}}, h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}^X \Sigma_{1,1}^X$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The first inclusion follows from Lemma 2.6 via Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5. We show the second inclusion. If $\alpha = 0$, it is obvious. If $\alpha = \beta = 1$, it follows from the Jayne-Rogers theorem [11]. Therefore, we can assume that $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\beta \geq 2$. As mentioned in Remark 1.7, if the small inductive dimensions of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are not ∞ , they are level 3/2 Borel isomorphic to ω^ω . Thus, by relativizing Corollary 3.8 via Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we can obtain the desired inclusion. $\square$

Given classes $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ of partial functions on the real line $\mathbb{R}$, consider the following cardinal invariant:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dec}(f, \mathcal{G}) &= \min \left\{ \text{card}(\mathcal{C}) : \bigcup \mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } \{f \upharpoonright C\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \right\}, \\ \text{dec}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) &= \sup \{ \text{dec}(f, \mathcal{G}) : f \in \mathcal{F}, \text{ and } \text{dom}(f) = \mathbb{R} \} \end{aligned}$$

The cardinal number $\text{dec}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is called the *decomposition number* of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ (see also Solecki [25]). Recall that the real line $\mathbb{R}$ is computably 3/2-isomorphic to Baire space ω^ω . Therefore, Corollary 3.7 can be rephrased as follows:

$$\text{dec} \left(\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X, \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{=}\alpha)}^X \right) \leq \omega.$$

3.3. Complexity of the Decomposition. In [7, Lemma 29], de Brecht showed an extension theorem concerning Σ_α^0 -measurable functions between quasi-Polish spaces. In the case of computably presented Polish space, we can show an effective version of the extension theorem.

Lemma 3.9 (Effective Extension Lemma). *Let $\alpha < \omega_1^X$ be a countable ordinal. Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces with $\mathcal{Y}$ Polish. For any partial $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ -computable function $F : \subseteq \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, there is a $\Pi_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}$ set D with $\text{dom}(F) \subseteq D \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and a $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ -computable extension $G : D \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ of F .*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{Y}$ is Polish, the diagonal set $\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}} = \{(x, x) \in \mathcal{Y}^2 : x \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ is Π_1^0 . Note that $\text{graph}(F) = (\text{id}, F)^{-1}(\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Since F is partially $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ -computable, there is a $\Pi_\alpha^{0,X}$ set $P \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\text{graph}(F) = P \cap (\text{dom}(F) \times \mathcal{Y})$.

Claim. $Q_n = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \text{diam}(P^{[x]}) < 1/n\}$ is $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ uniformly in $n \in \omega$, where $P^{[x]} = \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : (x, y) \in P\}$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

By induction, we show that $\text{diam}(S) > \varepsilon$ is $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ uniformly in $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ sets S and positive reals ε . For $\alpha = 1$, it is clear. Assume that $\alpha = \beta + 1$. Then, $S = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} T_n$ for a uniform sequence $\{T_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of $\Pi_\beta^{0,X}$ sets, and $\text{diam}(S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(\bigcup_{m \geq n} T_m)$. Hence, $\text{diam}(S) > \varepsilon$ if and only if $\text{diam}(\bigcup_{m \geq n} T_m) \geq \varepsilon$ for some $n \in \omega$. This condition is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$. A similar argument also works for limit ordinals.

Put $D = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} Q_n$. Then, by the above claim, D is $\Pi_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}$. Note that $\text{dom}(F) \subseteq D$, since $P^{[x]}$ is singleton for each $x \in \text{dom}(F)$. Thus, $P \cap (D \times \mathcal{Y})$ is the graph of a $\Sigma_\alpha^{0,X}$ -computable function extending F with the $\Pi_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}$ domain D . $\square$

We now estimate the complexity of our decomposition.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that represented spaces $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are Polish, and $2 \leq \alpha \leq \beta < \alpha \cdot 2 < \omega_1^X$. Then, we have the following inclusion:*

$$\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \cap \text{dec} \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \text{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Proof. Assume that F is decomposable into a uniform sequence $\{F_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of $\Sigma_{(\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^0$ -measurable functions. It suffices to estimate the complexity of $Q_n = \{x \in \text{dom}(F_n) : F(x) = F_n(x)\}$ in $\mathcal{X}$. By Effective Extension Lemma 3.9, we may assume that $\text{dom}(F_n)$ is $\Pi_{\gamma+2}^{0,X}$ for some $\gamma < \beta \hat{-} \alpha$. Then, $\Pi_{\gamma+2}^{0,X} \subseteq \Pi_{\beta}^{0,X}$ holds since $\alpha \geq 2$ implies that $\gamma < \beta \hat{-} 2$. Select $G_n \in \Pi_{\gamma+1}^{0,X}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ such that $\text{graph}(F_n) = G_n \cap (\text{dom}(F_n) \times \mathcal{Y})$. Note that $\alpha \cdot 2 = \alpha + \alpha > \beta$ implies that $\beta \hat{-} \alpha \leq \alpha$. Therefore, $G_n \in \Pi_{\gamma+1}^{0,X} \subseteq \Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}$. Thus, the function $H : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\alpha+1}^{0,X}(\mathcal{Y})$ sending x to $G_n^{[x]}$ is computable (see Brattka [2, Proposition 3.2]). Since F is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$, by Lemma 3.2, $F^{-1} \circ H(x) = F^{-1}(G_n^{[x]})$ is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$ uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n \in \omega$. Let $\in_{\beta+1} : \mathcal{X} \times \Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ be the membership relation defined by $\in_{\beta+1}(x, S) = 1$ if $x \in S$ and $\in_{\beta+1}(x, S) = 0$ otherwise, where recall that $\mathbb{S}$ is Sierpiński's connected two-point space. Then, $\in_{\beta+1}$ is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$ -computable. Therefore,

$$K_n = (\in_{\beta+1} \circ (\text{id}, F^{-1} \circ H))^{-1}(\{1\}) = \{(z, x) \in \mathcal{X}^2 : z \in F^{-1}(G_n^{[x]})\}$$

is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$. By definition, $G_n^{[x]} = \{F_n(x)\}$ for any $x \in \text{dom}(F_n)$. Therefore, we can see that $z \in F^{-1}(G_n^{[x]})$ if and only if $F(z) = F_n(x)$. Consequently, Q_n can be represented as follows:

$$Q_n = \text{dom}(F_n) \cap (\text{id}, \text{id})^{-1}(K_n \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$$

Consequently, this set is $\Sigma_{\beta+1}^{0,X}$ uniformly in $n \in \omega$. Let $\{Q_{n,m}\}_{m \in \omega}$ be a uniform sequence of $\Pi_{\beta}^{0,X}$ sets with $Q_n = \bigcup_{m \in \omega} Q_{n,m}$. Then, $F \upharpoonright Q_{n,m} = F_n \upharpoonright Q_{n,m}$ for each $n, m \in \omega$. $\square$

Corollary 3.11. *Let $X \in 2^\omega$ be a real. Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be represented spaces that are X -computably 3/2-isomorphic to ω^ω . For any ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1^X$ with $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha \cdot 2$, we have the following equality.*

$$\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \text{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Proof. Assume that F is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$. For $\alpha = 0$, it is obvious. If $\alpha = 1$, $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha \cdot 2$ implies $\beta = 1$. Then, it is the computable version of the Jayne-Rogers theorem proved by Pauly-de Brecht [18]. Thus, we can assume that $\alpha \geq 2$. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{X}} : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be X -computable 3/2-isomorphisms. As in the proof of Corollary 3.8, we can show that $h_{\mathcal{Y}} F h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \omega^\omega$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$. By Corollary 3.7, $h_{\mathcal{Y}} F h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}^X \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^{0,X}$. Then, by Lemma 3.10, we have $h_{\mathcal{Y}} F h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^{0,X}$. Consequently, $F = h_{\mathcal{Y}} h_{\mathcal{Y}}^{-1} F h_{\mathcal{X}} h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1, (\beta \hat{-} \alpha)}^X$ holds since $h_{\mathcal{Y}}, h_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} \in \text{dec}_{\beta+1}^X \Sigma_{1,1}^X$. Conversely, by Lemma 2.6, such F is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1, \beta+1}^X$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Relativize Corollary 3.11 by using Lemma 2.4, 2.5. $\square$

3.4. Open Question.

Problem 3.12. If $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are quasi-Polish spaces with small inductive dimensions $\neq \infty$, does the equality $\Sigma_{\alpha,\beta} = \Sigma_{\alpha,\beta}^{\rightarrow}$ hold for all countable ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$?

Problem 3.13. Can Theorem 1.9 be generalized to all countable ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$?

Acknowledgements. The author is partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for JSPS fellows. The author would like to thank Luca Motto Ros for his discourse on the concept of piecewise definable functions at the Dagstuhl Seminar 11411 entitled “Computing with Infinite Data: Topological and Logical Foundations”. The author is also grateful to Matthew de Brecht and Arno Pauly for their insightful comments and discussion.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alessandro Andretta. The SLO principle and the Wadge hierarchy. In Stefan Bold, Benedikt Löwe, Thoralf Räsch, and Johan van Benthem, editors, *Foundations of the Formal Sciences V. Infinite Games*, volume 11 of *Studies in Logic*, pages 1–38. College Publications, London, 2007.
- [2] Vasco Brattka. Effective Borel measurability and reducibility of functions. *Math. Log. Q.*, 51(1):19–44, 2005.
- [3] Vasco Brattka, Matthew de Brecht, and Arno Pauly. Closed choice and a uniform low basis theorem. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 163(8):986–1008, 2012.
- [4] Vasco Brattka and Guido Gherardi. Effective choice and boundedness principles in computable analysis. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 17(1):73–117, 2011.
- [5] Adam R. Day and Damir D. Dzhafarov. Limits to joining with generics and randomness. In R. Goldblatt R. Downey, J. Brendle and B. Kim, editors, *Proceedings of the 12th Asian Logic Conference*. World Scientific, 2012. to appear.
- [6] Matthew de Brecht. Levels of discontinuity, limit-computability, and jump operators. preprint.
- [7] Matthew de Brecht. Quasi-polish spaces. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 164(3):356–381, 2013.
- [8] Matthew de Brecht and Akihiro Yamamoto. Interpreting learners as realizers for Σ_2^0 -measurable functions (extended abstract). *Special Interests Group on Fundamental Problems in Artificial Intelligence (SIG-FPAI)*, 74:39–44, 2009.
- [9] Kojiro Higuchi and Takayuki Kihara. Inside the Muchnik degrees: Discontinuity, learnability, and constructivism. preprint.
- [10] Mathieu Hoyrup and Cristobal Rojas. An application of Martin-Löf randomness to effective probability theory. In Klaus Ambos-Spies, Benedikt Löwe, and Wolfgang Merkle, editors, *Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice, 5th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2009, Heidelberg, Germany, July 19–24, 2009. Proceedings*, volume 5635 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 260–269. Springer, 2009.
- [11] J. E. Jayne and C. A. Rogers. First level Borel functions and isomorphism. *J. Math. Pure Appl.*, 61:177–205, 1982.
- [12] Carl G. Jockusch Jr. and Richard A. Shore. Pseudo-jump operators. II: Transfinite iterations, hierarchies and minimal covers. *J. Symb. Log.*, 49(4):1205–1236, 1984.
- [13] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [14] Kenshi Miyabe. L_1 -computability, layerwise computability and Solovay reducibility. preprint.
- [15] Yiannis N. Moschovakis. *Descriptive Set Theory*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2009. 502 pages.
- [16] Luca Motto Ros. On the structure of finite levels and ω -decomposable Borel functions. 2012. preprint.
- [17] Luca Motto Ros, Philipp Schlicht, and Victor Selivanov. Wadge-like reducibilities on arbitrary quasi-polish spaces. preprint.

- [18] Arno Pauly and Matthew de Brecht. Non-deterministic computation and the Jayne Rogers Theorem. preprint, 2012.
- [19] Janusz Pawlikowski and Marcin Sabok. Decomposing Borel functions and structure at finite levels of the Baire hierarchy. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 163(12):1748–1764, 2012.
- [20] David B. Posner and Robert W. Robinson. Degrees joining to $\mathbf{0}'$. *J. Symb. Log.*, 46(4):714–722, 1981.
- [21] Marcin Sabok. σ -continuity and related forcings. *Arch. Math. Log.*, 48(5):449–464, 2009.
- [22] Victor L. Selivanov. Towards a descriptive set theory for domain-like structures. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 365(3):258–282, 2006.
- [23] Brian Semmes. *A Game for the Borel Functions*. PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2009.
- [24] Richard A. Shore and Theodore A. Slaman. Defining the Turing jump. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 6(5-6):711–722, 1999.
- [25] Slawomir Solecki. Decomposing Borel sets and functions and the structure of Baire class 1 functions. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 11:521–550, 1998.
- [26] Klaus Weihrauch. *Computable Analysis: An Introduction*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. Springer, 2000. 285 pages.
- [27] Martin Ziegler. Real computation with least discrete advice: A complexity theory of nonuniform computability with applications to effective linear algebra. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 163(8):1108–1139, 2012.